DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 488 AC 012 496

AUTHOR	Dutton, Donnie; And Others
TITLE	ABE Staff Development in Middle Tennessee.
INSTITUTION	Memphis State Univ., Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Adult, Vocational , and Technical Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 72
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Data Analysis; Evaluation Techniques; *Participant Satisfaction; Professional Personnel; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Resource Materials; *Staff Improvement; Supervisors; Teachers; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Tennessee

ABSTRACT

The overall effectiveness of the educational experiences provided at three Middle Tennessee ABE workshops was determined. Two instruments were used to collect data from approximately 300 adult basic education personnel from all counties in Middle Tennessee; these instruments were a questionnaire and an evaluation scale. The participants' responses are presented under Profile of the Participants, Physical Facilities, Objectives, Program, Strengths, Weaknesses, and Overall Rating. Analysis of the data shows that the three workshops were successful. Appendixes present a list of Staff and Resource Persons, the Program, a List of Participants, and Evaluation Forms. (DB)

ED 061488

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABE STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN MIDDLE TENNESSEE

By

Donnie Dutton
Professor and Director
Adult Education
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

Luke Easter
Regional Supervisor
Adult Education
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Charles Holt
Regional Supervisor
Adult Education
State Department of Education
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Sponsored By

Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education
of the U. S. Office of Education
Tennessee State Department of Education
Southern Regional Education Board
Tennessee Technological University
Middle Tennessee State University
Middle Tennessee Local School Systems

April, 1972
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

AC012 496

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to express their appreciation to the many resource persons mentioned elsewhere in this document for their assistance in providing the instruction at these workshops.

Special appreciation is acknowledged for assistance provided by the following persons in arranging the workshops:

1. Dr. D. B. Pockat, Dean, College of Education, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.

2. Mr. Marshall Foster, Director of Adult Education, Davidson County-Nashville Metro School System, Nashville, Tennessee.

3. Dr. O. C. Stewart, Dean of Extended Services, Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

A special note of thanks is due Linda Balentine, Adult Education Stenographer, Memphis State University, and Louise Fitzgerald and Janele Holt, Adult Education Secretaries, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee, for typing the materials used in this study and the typing of the study itself.

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Background	
Purpose of Study	
Methodology	
Hypotheses	
II. PRESENTATION OF DATA BY ITEM	6
Profile of the Participants	
Physical Facilities	
Objectives	
Program	
Strengths of Workshops	
Weaknesses of Workshops	
Overall Rating	
III. SUMMARY	17
Appendices	
A. STAFF AND RESOURCE PERSONS	20
B. PROGRAM	23
C. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	25
D. EVALUATION FORMS	31

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

In implementing one phase of the Tennessee concept of staff development, three adult basic education institutes were held in the Summer of 1971. These were all two-week institutes and carried graduate credit. They were as follows:

1. Guidance and Counseling, Tennessee State University, June 14-25, 1971.
2. Materials, Memphis State University, July 5-16, 1971.
3. Reading, University of Tennessee, July 19-30, 1971.

Approximately thirty ABE teachers and supervisors attended each of the institutes, with the thirty being allocated in the following manner: ten each from East, Middle, and West Tennessee. The rationale underlying this distribution was to place trained personnel in all three content areas in every region of the State of Tennessee to serve as resource persons for local programs.

Another phase of the overall staff development plan was to conduct one-day workshops across the State of Tennessee during the 1971-72 academic year. Those workshops were to serve as a dissemination device for acquainting all ABE personnel in Tennessee with what transpired in these institutes--the multiplier effect. Furthermore, the persons

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

trained at the institutes were to serve as resource persons in conducting these workshops. Three such workshops were conducted in Middle Tennessee at the following locations and on the following dates:

1. West End Junior High School, Nashville, Tennessee, December 11, 1971 (referred to in the remainder of this document simply as Nashville).

2. Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, December 18, 1971.

3. Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee, January 29, 1972.

The primary objective of the three workshops was to acquaint the participants with what transpired in the summer institutes in order that they might be cognizant of the resources that are available to them as they encounter problems in local programs.

Specifically, those participants attending the summer institute on guidance and counseling were provided with learning experiences to assist them in developing the ability to:

1. Assist adults in planning programs that will enable them to capitalize on their interests, strengths, and weaknesses as they pursue their educational and/or vocational goals.

2. Provide the individual assistance in planning an educational program based on his capacity, interests, and potential designed to help acquire the competencies and skills that will assist him in seeking solutions to personal and community problems.

3. Provide a setting in which the individual seeking assistance is able to develop sufficient insight and self-understanding so that he can make his own decisions and select procedures that will lead to solution of his problems in a personally satisfying and socially acceptable manner.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Specifically, those participants attending the institute on materials were provided with learning experiences to assist them in developing the ability to:

1. Evaluate commercial materials based upon recognized accepted principles of material evaluation.
2. Develop materials suitable for use in local ABE classrooms.
3. Use commercial newspapers in the various instructional areas--reading, language arts, math, social studies, etc.

Specifically, those participants attending the institute on reading were provided with learning experiences to assist them in developing the ability to:

1. Increase their understanding of the subject of reading as related to word attack and comprehension skills.
2. Develop skill in diagnosing reading difficulties and placing students in reading programs.
3. Increase their competency in the selection and evaluation of reading materials.
4. Incorporate reading skills into other curriculum areas in ABE.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the overall effectiveness of the educational experiences provided at the three Middle Tennessee ABE workshops conducted December 11, 1971, December 18, 1971, and January 29, 1972, excluding an objective measure of gain in knowledge.

Methodology

Source of Data

The population used in this study was local adult basic education personnel from all the counties in Middle Tennessee. Responsibility

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

for recruitment and planning was assumed by the State Department of Education's Adult Education Staff and Local ABE Program Supervisors. Approximately three hundred persons, excluding staff and consultants, attended these sessions.

Collection of Data

Two instruments were used to collect the data for this study. The first was a questionnaire designed to obtain demographic data and participant reaction to the various facets of the workshop.

The second instrument was an evaluation scale developed by Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner.[1] According to its authors, it appears to be a valid instrument for obtaining overall participant reaction to a short-term workshop. The scale consists of twenty items arranged in rank order of value, with item number one being the best thing that could be checked, item number two, the second best, and so on, with item number twenty, the least favorable response.

Statistical Technique

It was not the intent of the writers to make any generalizations to a broader population; therefore, no inferential statistics were used. Only arithmetical means and percentages were employed.

---

[1]Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner, "An Attitude Scale Technique for Evaluating Meetings," Adult Education, Volume III, No. 4 (Spring, 1957), pp. 212-215.

Hypotheses

In the absence of any attempt to generalize to a broader population and the deletion of any statistical technique designed to test significant differences between variables, no hypotheses were formulated.

CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION OF DATA BY ITEM

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the responses to the items in the questionnaire and to the Kropp-Verner Scale. It will consist of the following sections:

1. Profile of the participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.
5. Strengths.
6. Weaknesses.
7. Overall rating.

Profile of the Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the workshops, the following distributions were noted:

		TTU[1] Per Cent	MTSU[2] Per Cent	N[3] Per Cent	Total Per Cent
1. Sex					
Male		49.09	33.33	39.45	39.37
Female		50.91	66.67	60.55	60.63
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
2. Age					
Less than 35		18.18	17.98	42.20	28.46
35 and over		81.82	82.02	57.80	71.54
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

---

[1], [2], [3]TTU refers to the workshop held at Tennessee Technological University, MTSU refers to the workshop held at Middle Tennessee State University, N refers to the workshop held at Nashville.

		TTU Per Cent	MTSU Per Cent	N Per Cent	Total Per Cent
3. Race					
White		94.44	78.89	63.30	75.49
Non White		5.56	21.11	36.70	24.51
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
4. Education					
Less than Master's		69.81	68.54	55.56	63.20
Master's or more		30.19	31.46	44.44	36.80
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
5. ABE Experience					
Less than 1 year		25.92	34.00	18.52	24.06
1-3 years		27.78	36.00	47.22	39.62
More than 3 years		46.30	30.00	34.26	36.32
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
6. ABE Position					
Supervisor		23.64	16.67	6.54	13.89
Teacher		76.36	83.33	93.46	86.11
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Physical Facilities

Relative to the physical facilities provided, the following ratings were obtained out of a maximum potential positive score of 5.00.[4]

	TTU	MTSU	N	Total
1. Adequate space was provided for large group meetings.	4.36	4.21	4.29	4.28
2. Adequate space was provided for small group discussions.	4.35	4.22	4.17	4.22
3. The meeting facilities were conducive to learning.	4.44	4.12	4.27	4.25

[4]These ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

Objectives

Relative to the feedback pertaining to objectives of the workshops, the following ratings were received out of a maximum potential positive score of 5.00.[5]

	TTU	MTSU	N	Total
1. The objectives were relevant to the needs of the participants.	4.35	4.06	4.14	4.15
2. The objectives were clearly defined to the participants.	4.20	3.99	3.93	4.01
3. Adequate time was available for the objectives to be realized.	3.00	3.47	3.84	3.52

Program

Relative to the program conducted at the workshops, the following ratings were received out of a maximum potential positive score of 5.00.[6]

	TTU	MTSU	N	Total
1. The content was relevant to my needs.	4.09	3.93	4.09	4.03
2. The program was in line with the stated objectives.	4.07	4.04	4.09	4.07
3. The content was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job.	4.06	4.08	3.89	4.00

---

[5]These ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

[6]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 5.

Strengths of Workshops

Tennessee Technological University

The strengths of the workshop at Tennessee Technological University, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Competent leaders and instructors (22 responses).
2. The main speaker was excellent (10 responses).
3. Usefulness of material presented since it related to ABE teachers' needs (10 responses).
4. Provided an awareness of what others are doing in ABE (8 responses).
5. Was well planned (8 responses).
6. Guidance and reading (6 responses).
7. Question and answer sessions (3 responses).
8. Meeting place was excellent; hospitality extended by hosting institution (3 responses).
9. Small group discussion (2 responses).
10. Information presented on materials (2 responses).
11. Can do a better job of recruiting; better understand our students (2 responses).
12. Provided me with greater insight into the program.
13. Helped me to examine again the objectives of ABE, also encouraged me to strive to improve my teaching.
14. Helped me to evaluate my own strengths and weaknesses; much "food for thought" and future improvement.

Middle Tennessee State University

The strengths of the workshop at Middle Tennessee State University,

as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Competent consultants and instructors (28 responses).
2. Reading session (13 responses).
3. Materials session (12 responses).
4. Well planned and organized (11 responses).
5. Gained new ideas from instructors and other ABE teachers (10 responses).
6. Content met the needs of ABE teachers (8 responses).
7. Small group discussion (5 responses).
8. Inspired me to do a better job (5 responses).
9. Guidance and counseling, including recruitment and retention (4 responses).
10. Meeting place and overall atmosphere good (2 responses).
11. Participation by participants.

Nashville

The strengths of the workshop at Nashville, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Competent consultants and instructors (41 responses).
2. Small group discussions (16 responses).
3. Materials session (13 responses).
4. Well planned and organized (12 responses).
5. Content covered was related to my needs (11 responses).
6. Guidance and counseling, including recruitment and retention (9 responses).
7. Learned some new techniques (7 responses).
8. Exchange of ideas with other teachers (5 responses).

9. Reading (5 responses).

10. Participant involvement (5 responses).

11. Each participant allowed to choose group session (2 responses).

12. Made aware of problems that exist in general manner.

Weaknesses of Workshops

Tennessee Technological University

The weaknesses of the workshop at Tennessee Technological University, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Lack of time (31 responses).

2. None (4 responses).

3. Need to examine more materials (2 responses).

4. Too many materials to be examined.

5. Need more information on testing.

6. Tried to cover too much.

7. Dinner was put off too long.

Middle Tennessee State University

The weaknesses of the workshop at Middle Tennessee State University, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Lack of time (23 responses).

2. None (7 responses).

3. Materials session needed strengthening (6 responses).

4. The building was spacious but heating poor (2 responses).

5. Too near Christmas (2 responses).

6. Guidance session; participation not encouraged (2 responses).

7. Reading session.

8. Math.

9. Social studies.

10. Repetition of previous program.

11. Instruction in class was not as well organized as could have been.

12. Too many canned talks and not enough people that have actually been in the field.

13. Did not tell what to do in separate cases.

14. Unable to see overhead projector.

15. Oversimplification of problems; idealism spoken of as actual when it probably is not possible.

16. Too much sitting; more committee work to discuss other adult education classes in Middle Tennessee.

Nashville

The weaknesses of the workshop at Nashville, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Lack of time (18 responses).

2. None (10 responses).

3. Would liked to have visited the other consultants' presentations (7 responses).

4. Need more specifics (5 responses).

5. Difficult to hear the speakers in the auditorium (5 responses).

6. Persons from other counties seemed to be excluded--problems and discussion unrelated to them (2 responses).

7. Too long (2 responses).

8. Began too early.

9. Speaker should have been first on the program so that after small group discussions we could have regrouped and discussed.

10. Less speeches and more time to actually prepare something instead of being told how.

11. Attempted too wide an area, better to cover a smaller area in greater depth than to skim--leaves a frustrated feeling of unasnwered questions.

12. My instructor did not give enough time to important things; time schedule was not followed and was confusing.

13. Would like to have had a choice of group attended.

14. Lack of practical involvement.

15. Refreshments were not ready.

16. Too lengthy in general meeting.

17. Introductory directions unclear.

18. Interest area leader spent too much time on introduction and, hence, did not finish material (reading) to be covered.

19. Lack of participation by those attending.

20. Sessions not geared to what the teacher would like.

21. My group did not stick with objective; guidance raised questions but no answers.

22. Too much "speeching"; not enough idea exchanging; did not meet my personal needs.

23. Some speakers qualified in profession; however, not all can relate effectively what they know (lack of speaking skills).

24. Need more material.

25. Nothing practical--just "lofty" psychological learning factors; needed more give and take in our group meetings and less lectures.

26. In some areas, group discussions wandered too far from my areas of interest.

27. Lack of prior preparation.

28. Held on Saturday.

29. Not being able to obtain the benefit or hear reports of other group meetings.

30. Quality of leadership.

31. Not enough breaks.

32. More individual sharing.

33. Breaks lasted too long; our group wasted thirty minutes.

34. Small group facilities.

35. Tight scheduling.

36. Resource person in my group.

37. Not enough directness in making points in small group.

38. Time of year.

39. No clearly defined objectives.

40. Too much time in certain sections.

41. "Set-up" for coffee break less than desirable.

42. Lack of discussion and exchange of ideas.

43. My attention span is shorter than 1 1/2 hours.

44. The length of the meeting seems to exceed the time one is able to enthusiastically participate.

45. No opportunity to share in experiences; meeting on Sabbath Day.

46. There was no need to have an hour speaker that talked about a topic of comparing adults to children; the techniques are different for adults!

47. Did not take handicapped into consideration.

Overall Rating

Three measures were taken in an attempt to measure the overall value ascribed to the ABE workshops. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: As a result of the in-service, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job more satisfactorily. Available responses for their selection were strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. Out of a maximum possible score of 5.00, the value ascribed to this item was 4.19 for those participants attending at Tennessee Technological University, 4.01 for those attending at Middle Tennessee State University, and 4.10 for those attending at Nashville. The combined total was 4.13.[7]

The second measure taken was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the in-service is very high, high, medium, low, or very low. Out of a maximum possible score of 5.00, the value ascribed to this item was 4.43 for those participants attending at Tennessee Technological University, 4.07 for those attending at Middle Tennessee State University, and 4.15 for those attending at Nashville. The combined total was 4.14.[8]

---

[7]These ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

[8]These ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

The third measure taken was the participants' reaction to the workshops as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to values on the Kropp-Verner Scale, was 3.35 for those participants attending at Tennessee Technological University, 3.60 for those attending at Middle Tennessee State University, and 3.65 for those attending at Nashville (the lower the score, the better the workshop as viewed by the participants; the maximum desirable score is 1.13 and the least desirable score is 10.89). The combined rating for all three workshops was 3.56. The 3.56 rating placed the value of the workshops in Middle Tennessee at approximately item five on the Kropp-Verner Scale, which means that there were fifteen less favorable responses below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY

As one peruses the various evaluative data presented in this study, it should become evident that the three workshops were successful. Most of the items received a 4.00 rating or higher out of a maximum potential of 5.00.[1] This plus the participants' comments relative to strengths and weaknesses resulted in this conclusion. Possibly, the major problem that evolved was that of trying to accomplish "too much in too short a time." This should be considered in future formulation and implementation of staff development activities.

---

[1]This does not include the Kropp-Verner Scale rating which is measured in a reverse manner, i.e., the lower the score the better the rating. It proved to be reflective of a successful endeavor also.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STAFF AND
RESOURCE PERSONS

Tennessee Technological University Workshop

Mrs. Sophia Brotherton
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

Dr. Edward T. Brown
Director, ABE Project
Southern Regional Education Bd.
Atlanta, Georgia

Mr. Luke Easter
Adult Education Supervisor
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Mrs. Flora Fowler
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Holt
Adult Education Supervisor
State Department of Education
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Kerr
Coordinator of Adult Education
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Miss Deotha Malone
Sumner County Schools
Gallatin, Tennessee

Miss Ruby Spear
Lawrence County Schools
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Dr. O. C. Stewart, Dean
Division of Extended Services
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, Tennessee

Middle Tennessee State University

Dr. Leonard Breen
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Mr. Luke Easter
Adult Education Supervisor
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Mrs. Joan Ford
Bristol City Schools
Bristol, Tennessee

Mrs. Flora Fowler
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee

Mr. Charles W. Holt
Adult Education Supervisor
State Department of Education
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Kerr
Coordinator of Adult Education
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. D. B. Pockat, Dean
College of Education
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Dr. Charles Sams, Supervisor
Pupil Personnel Services
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Nashville

Mr. Howard Allen
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Ray Baker
Riverbend School
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Edward T. Brown
Director, ABE Project
Southern Regional Education Bd.
Atlanta, Georgia

Mrs. Sophia Brotherton
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

Mr. Luke Easter
Adult Education Supervisor
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Marshall Foster
Director of Adult Education
Davidson County-Nashville
Metro Schools
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Holt
Adult Education Supervisor
State Department of Education
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Kerr
Coordinator of Adult Education
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Miss Deotha Malone
Sumner County Schools
Gallatin, Tennessee

Mrs. Sallye J. Moore
Montgomery County-Clarksville
Clarksville, Tennessee

Miss Ruby Spear
Lawrence County
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Mr. Jim Wright
Nashville, Tennessee

APPENDIX B

ABE IN-SERVICE*
DECEMBER 11, 1971
WEST END JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

Program

Registration.	8:00 - 8:20
Welcome	8:20 - 8:25
Administration	8:25 - 8:30
Interest Sessions	8:30 - 11:30
Reading Address.	11:30 - 12:30
Lunch	12:30 - 1:30

*The programs at the other two workshops followed this same format.

APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Tennessee Technological University

Bledsoe County
Norma Jean Panky

Clay County
Geneva Bartlett
Wanda Meadows
Tim Reecer
Eldon B. Scott
Carl Walker
Lillian White

Cumberland County
Everett L. Gibson
Cora Lee Jewell
Norene Padgett

Dekalb County
Phillip Ashburn
Woodrow Frazier
James McGinnis

Fentress County
Virgil V. Easley
O. O. Frogge
Ruble Upchurch
Luther B. Wilkinson
Eugene Wright

Macon County
Philena Blankenship
Lucille Jenkins
E. B. Krantz

Overton County
Mary M. Beard
Steve Daniels
Charles B. Davis
Edwin S. Garrett
Glen H. Masters
Billy Joe Officer
Hugh L. Ogletree
Benny Smith
William E. Smith

Pickett County
Luther E. Brooks

Putnam County
Goodwin Harding
Charles Looper
Elaine Patton
Retta Sells
J. G. Shelley

Smith County
Louise Sharenberger
Eleanor Smotherman
Odell Winfree

Warren County
Synda Ruth Batey
Elsie Sue Cowell
Katherine David
Mary G. Higginbotham
Peggy Jennings
Thedra Newby
Larry Rich
Rad Spivey
Maxine Winton

White County
Laurabel Cloyd
Howell Hipsher
Beulah Johnson
T. L. Leonard
Frances Looney
Frances Marriott
Lee Milligan
Ruby Sparkman
Martha Speck
Mamie Sorell
Pauline Walker
Fay Wallace
Roberta L. Warren

Others Attending

Jim Andrews
Charles Bates
Luke Easter
Flora Fowler
Billy Glover
Charles Holt
Tom Jones
Charles Kerr
Deotha Malone
Allen Peters
Mutt Quillen
Ruby Spear
O. C. Stewart

Middle Tennessee State University Workshop

Coffee County
Melvin Duke
Roy Perry
Elaine Umbarger

Franklin County
Lois Acklen
Elizabeth Baker
Thelma Brazier
Bethel Clark
Gilbert Clark
Lola Clark
Louise Dement
John Hunt
Fayna Kennedy
Katrine Kolodjizky
Ruth Langford
Mary London
Ethelene Lujan
Connie Partin
Patty Priest
Agnes Sargent
Annie Shedd
Peggy Soderham
Richard Soderham
Juanita Syler
Becky Templeton
Mildred Traywick

Giles County
Alice Coleman
Delcie Crenshaw
J. R. McClure
James L. Wood

Grundy County
Mike Bryant
James Campbell
Kathleen Jones
Nannie Kilgore
S. H. Northcutt
Henrietta Ray
Lynda Schoenmann
Carl Shetter
Patsy Tucker

Lawrence County
Horace Alsup
Hughes Cheatwood
Martha Crawford
Joseph Douglas
B. H. Hardwick
Ruby Spear
James Story
Mary Sutton
Dwight Woods

Lincoln County
Melvin Allison
Geda Craig
John Taylor
Lois White

Marion County
Mary Anderson
Sandra Anderson
Bob Colston
Ruth Deakins
Edna Graham

Marion County (cont.)
Jo Dean Humphreys
Patricia Lambart
Allie McConnel
Ann Metz
Fred Morrison
Edna Pickett
John Shelby
Blanche Turner
Lynn Yound

Marshall County
Earl Barnes
Linda Ledford
Mrs. Robert Mason
Elaine Wilson

Maury County
Douglas Burton
Edward Kimes
James Peebles
Joan Spencer
Hitsie Taylor
Ruth Whitaker
Mattie Wright

Moore County
Kathleen Smith
Helene Wiseman

Rutherford County
Susan Barnes
Preston Blakney
Mary Butler
Frances Carlson
Fruzzie Foster
Margaret Hitt
Geneva Johnson
Patricia Kownslar
Quindal Lane
Myrtle Lord
Barbara Meacham
Jim Neely
Ronald Richmond
Elizabeth Robinson
Joe Troop
Jim Tune
Queen Washington
Marie Witherspoon
Annie Zackery

Tullahoma City
Dean Allison
Mildred Bennett
Harry McDonald

Wayne County
Pauline Dixon
Marietta Lay
Ethel McWilliams
Eva Smith

Williamson County
Don Calvert
Margaret Cunningham
Henry Hardison
Ed Slayton
Mrs. H. L. Watson

Wilson County
Gradie Lou Garrett
Floyd Graham
Homer Smith

Others Attending
Jim Andrews
Luke Easter
Joan Ford
Flora Fowler
Charles Holt
Tom Jones
Charles Kerr
Allen Pettus
D. B. Pockat
Charles Sams

Nashville

Davidson County

Howard Allen
Jacqueline Baker
Jewell Baker
Ray Baker
Catherine Barbee
Victoria Barefoot
Sharron Bell
Victoria Bell
Edwin Bohanon
Minnie Brazleton
Carolyn Bridges
Edith Brooks
Barbara Brown
Beth Brown
June Brown
Ann Bryant
Dena Buktenica
Eunice Campbell
Kenneth Clay
William Crawford
James Crowder
Susan Crowder
Mackie Driver
Nannie Driver
Norman Edwards
Virginia Frazier
Marshall Foster
Mary Goldman
Mary Hamby
Donna Hase
Sedley Hassel
Ann Haynes
Franklin Jones
Mary Jones
Mary Koory
Gladys Lawrence
Edwina Lee
R. E. Lee
Ruth Loftin
Joan Lovell
Patricia Maclin
Sadie Madry
Richard McMillen
Connie Moore
Nancy Officer
W. J. Officer
Ann Parker
Mary Parrish
Bettye Payne
John Ponder
Hugh Raines
Bobbie Ray
Barbara Richards
Iva Robertson
Emmett Scott
Joe Seibert
Barbara Shelton
Leara Simmons
Margaret Sims
Patricia Sisemore
Arnold Smith
Lynda Smith
Howell Sparks
Mildred Starks
Elizabeth Stewart
Judith Stockton
Ann Sullivan
James Thompson
Ronald Turner
Jerre Vaughn
Joan Walker
Florence Weiland
Ella Wilkins
Catherine Woodson
James E. Wright
Jim Wright

Houston County

George Alsobrooks
Raymond Blair

Humphreys County

John Larkin
Gloria Logan
Andrew Stitt

Lawrence County

Ruby Spear

Montgomery County-Clarksville
W. C. Cowan
Marty Darnell
Norman England
Arthur Hunt
Marianne Jacumin
Lettie Kendall
Mrs. M. D. Moon
Sallye J. Moore
Flora Richbourg
Mrs. M. B. Sleigh
Marie Stephenson
John Wilson

Perry County
Ronnie Graves
Sarah Lyon

Robertson County
Billy Carneal
Sylvia Malone
Joe Morris
Nora Payne
Jim Sutes
Clayton Sykes
Bert Tolleson
Hugh Traughber
Harriett Villines

Stewart County
Merle Chance

Sumner County
Frank Brinkley
James Epperson
Larry Foxall
General Freed
Hazel Hall
Ronnie Holderfield
Anna B. Ligon
Deotha Malone
Henry Roark
Carrie Smith
Inez Upton
Linda Webster
Nellie Yokley

Others Attending
Jim Andrews
George Brooks
Sophia Brotherton
William Brotherton
Luke Easter
Charles Holt
Mildred Hurley
Tom Jones
Allen Pettus
Toni Powell
Olen B. Wall

APPENDIX D

TENNESSEE REGIONAL IN-SERVICE
1971-72

PERSONAL DATA

1. SEX

_____Male

_____Female

2. AGE

_____Less than 35

_____35 and over

3. RACE

_____White

_____Non White

4. DEGREE PRESENTLY HELD

_____Less than Master's

_____Master's or more

5. ACTUAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN ABE

_____Less than 1 academic year

_____1-3 academic years

_____More than 3 academic years

6. ABE POSITION HELD

_____Supervisor

_____Teacher

3/

7. PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT

_____West Tennessee (Glover)

_____Middle Tennessee (Easter & Holt)

_____East Tennessee (Bates)

****

Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. There are no correct or incorrect answers so feel free to express your feelings. Please give us your own opinion about these items by circling the answer that best describes how you feel. Also, a blank is provided after each statement for any written comments that you may care to make.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

8. ADEQUATE SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR LARGE GROUP MEETINGS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

9. ADEQUATE SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

10. THE MEETING FACILITIES WERE CONDUCIVE TO LEARNING.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

OBJECTIVES

11. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE IN-SERVICE WERE RELEVANT TO THE NEEDS OF THE PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

12. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE IN-SERVICE WERE CLEARLY DEFINED TO THE PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

13. ADEQUATE TIME WAS AVAILABLE FOR THE OBJECTIVES OF THE IN-SERVICE TO BE REALIZED.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

PROGRAM

14. THE CONTENT OF THE IN-SERVICE WAS RELEVANT TO MY NEEDS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

15. THE PROGRAM WAS IN LINE WITH THE STATED OBJECTIVES OF THE IN-SERVICE.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

16. THE CONTENT OF THE IN-SERVICE WAS SUCH THAT IT ANSWERED QUESTIONS THAT CONCERNED ME RELATIVE TO MY JOB.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

EVALUATION

17. AS A RESULT OF THE IN-SERVICE, I FEEL THAT I WILL NOW BE BETTER ABLE TO PERFORM MY JOB MORE SATISFACTORILY.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

18. MY OVERALL RATING FOR THE IN-SERVICE IS:

Very High | High | Medium | Low | Very Low

Comments: _____

_____

****

Please complete the following items:

19. Identify the greatest overall strengths of the In-service.

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. Identify the greatest overall weaknesses of the In-service.

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. What topics do you feel need to be covered in future in-service sessions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. Following is a list of the major topics that participants attending the summer institutes at Memphis State, Tennessee State, and UT this past summer indicated that should be covered in future two-week institutes. Please add any additional ones that you feel are important and rank them in order of importance by placing a 1 by the one most important, a 2 by the one of second importance, etc.

_____Guidance and Counseling _____

_____Recruitment and Retention _____

_____Teaching of Reading _____

_____Materials Selection & Development _____

_____Principles of Curriculum Development _____

_____Adult Learning Centers _____

23. Did you attend a two-week institute this past summer?

_____Yes

_____No

KROPP-VERNER EVALUATION SCALE*

Please follow directions carefully: Read all twenty of the following statements. Check as many statements as necessary to describe your reaction to the Institute.

1. ____ It was one of the most rewarding experiences I have ever had.
2. ____ Exactly what I wanted.
3. ____ I hope we can have another one in the near future.
4. ____ It provided the kind of experience that I can apply to my own situation.
5. ____ It helped me personally.
6. ____ It solved some problems for me.
7. ____ I think it served its purpose.
8. ____ It had some merits.
9. ____ It was fair.
10. ____ It was neither very good nor very poor.
11. ____ I was mildly disappointed.
12. ____ It was not exactly what I needed.
13. ____ It was too general.
14. ____ I am not taking any new ideas away.
15. ____ It didn't hold my interest.
16. ____ It was much too superficial.
17. ____ I leave dissatisfied.
18. ____ It was very poorly planned.
19. ____ I didn't learn a thing.
20. ____ It was a complete waste of time.

*Dr. R. Kropp and Dr. C. Verner, Florida State University

(If you wish, add any comments on reverse side of this page.)

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAY 11 1972
on Adult Educatio